

63-9514

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT : Assistant Director for Central Reference Comments
on Inspector General's Survey of Office of
Central Reference

1. In the attached paper, the Assistant Director for Central Reference has concurred, or concurred in part, with 36 out of the 42 specific actions proposed in 28 recommendations contained in the Inspector General's Survey Report of OCR, dated September 1963. In most cases, whether of concurrence, partial concurrence or non-concurrence, additional OCR comments are set forth concerning the IG's recommendations. I deem it necessary, in the few following instances, to offer certain further observations and comments of my own as a result of the OCR remarks.

Recommendation 2.a. and b. in the IG report reads as follows:

"...

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director (Intelligence) request the Office of Personnel to conduct a comprehensive classification study of the Office of Central Reference, including a comparative analysis with other Deputy Director (Intelligence) components, with the view to possible general upgrading of positions in the Office of Central Reference. This study should include specifically although not be limited to the following considerations in particular:

a. The creation of three levels of analysts in the Office of Central Reference: junior analyst (GS-7), analyst (GS-9), and senior analyst (GS-11). Such grades should be awarded employees upon meeting established professional criteria, regardless of supervisory responsibilities.

b. The redistribution of analyst and clerical slots to provide that analysts devote the bulk of their time to professional duties while clerical work is performed by clerical personnel.

..."

SUBJECT: AD/CR Comments on IG's Survey of OCR

The OCR comment thereon states:

"...

General Comment:

We note that this recommendation is considered by the IG to be the keynote of his report and agree that a comprehensive review of the grade structure, including a comparative analysis with other DDI components, is strongly indicated. A general upgrading of positions in OCR we believe to be justified on the basis of the character and quality of the tasks being performed; increased opportunities for advancement would materially benefit morale and would contribute to making employment in OCR much more attractive as a career. Although previous efforts of this kind, some of them very recent, have been disappointingly unproductive, we will again request the Office of Personnel to undertake such a review, citing the findings and strong recommendations of the IG in support. In commenting upon the specific proposals which follow, we note with approval the fact that the list is not considered to be comprehensive; there are other areas equally deserving of careful review.

a. Concur in part

Comment:

With the GS-9 grade level already established for the journeyman analyst, the basic and most important change needed is to establish the GS-11 level for senior analysts regardless of supervisory responsibility. The GS-7 level is needed as a sub-professional rather than a junior analyst category. It should be identified as an intelligence or research assistant and filled by strong clerical types, not college graduates.

b. Concur in part

Comment:

The redistribution of analyst and clerical slots is an OCR management responsibility. I have initiated a study of clerical aspects of professional jobs and will rebalance analyst and clerical slots wherever the findings indicate this to be feasible.

..."

SUBJECT: AD/CR Comments on IG's Survey of OCR

2. I disagree with the AD/CR's partial concurrence and comment on Recommendation 2.a. and b. As the survey reflected, we found a widespread feeling by OCR employees that they are not treated equitably in grade structure with personnel of other components performing similar functions. We also found that inequities do, in fact, exist. Probably the largest single area in which this discontent was encountered was among analyst personnel. This was largely because of the lack of prospect for advancement beyond the GS-9 level. There was no ladder up which an analyst of demonstrated merit might climb without having to assume supervisory functions, either real or fancied. As the report noted, there appeared to be in OCR a number of artificial "units" contrived almost entirely to justify "supervisory" responsibilities in order to obtain GS-11 grade classifications.

3. It seems to me that the AD/CR is using the IG supporting material to Recommendation No. 2.a., 2.b., and Recommendation No. 4.a., (concerning EOD grades for Junior Analyst personnel) to obtain higher level clerical and other sub-professional slots. This defeats a part of the purpose of the recommendation, which is, to establish an orderly progression for recruitment and advancement of deserving analyst personnel, and to correct the existing situation in which many analysts are performing clerical-type functions.

Recommendation No. 4.b. in the IG Report reads as follows:

"...

It is recommended that:

The Assistant Director for Central Reference, in collaboration with the Director of Personnel:

...

b. Examine the records of personnel who were recruited in grades lower than the established policy in effect at that time to determine whether or not such persons should be given accelerated promotions to place them in grades equitable with the standard policy.

..."

4. AD/CR concurs with this recommendation and comments that the records of such personnel have been examined with the finding that accelerated promotions have compensated for possible inequities in the EOD grades of the handful of people concerned.

SUBJECT: AD/CR Comments on IG's Survey of OCR

There are four individual cases which have been brought to my attention in which no such promotion actions have been taken and in which the personnel appear to meet the criteria for accelerated promotion. The names of these individuals are listed below in order that they may be given appropriate consideration in the event they were overlooked.



Recommendation No. 18 of the IG Report stated:

"...

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director (Intelligence) request the Director of Personnel to provide on a temporary basis from the Interim Assignment Section (clerical pool), if possible, five additional key-punch operators for Machine Division to obviate excessive overtime and reduce backlog.

..."

OCR nonconcurs with this recommendation with the following:

"...

Comment:

The use of clerical personnel from the Interim Assignment Section on a short-term basis has proved impractical. Because of their training assignments and inexperience, it has been impossible to arrange satisfactory production schedules. The Machine Division does, however, make regular use of personnel in the pool who have been recruited as key-punch operators and who have received specific training for this work. This arrangement also has its limitations since these operators can work only on unclassified material. Backlogs, when they occur, usually involve classified programs."

5. There appears to be some misunderstanding here and the AD/CR argument actually supports the recommendation as stated. The recommendation specified that an attempt be made to obtain from the clerical

SUBJECT: AD/CR Comments on IG's Survey of OCR

pool five additional key-punch operators. Obviously, assignment of personnel not trained as key-punch operators would serve no useful purpose. We agree that the assignment of noncleared, key-punch operators has its limitations. However, they can work on the unclassified material, thus freeing the cleared operators for use on the classified programs wherein the backlogs generally exist.

Recommendation No. 21, in the IG Report reads as follows:

"...

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director (Intelligence) in collaboration with the other Deputy Directors establish a group of representatives of the major components of the Agency who will discuss and re-examine with the Librarian and Chief of the Selection Staff the current policies pertaining to book procurement. This same group would be available to give advice on any subsequent developments in intelligence priorities possibly affecting the selection of books and documents.

..."

The AD/CR nonconcurs in this recommendation and comments:

"...

Comment:

"The Central Reference Advisory Group (CRAG), the membership of which consists of the Assistant Directors of the Intelligence Directorate, Chief/FI and AD/SI/DD/S&T, issued a notice (CRAG 6-61) on 6 December 1961 covering the 'Selection Policy of CIA Library'. This notice will be revised and reissued. This revision will particularly solicit the advice, on a continuing basis, of individuals of all levels who may be aware of inadequacies in the Library collection.

"The recommendation that a group representing the major components of the Agency undertake to advise the Library on the selection of books and documents, while superficially attractive, does not take into account the fact that it is virtually impossible to establish a committee of manageable size, which is also sufficiently knowledgeable in this very broad area, to provide meaningful guidance.

SUBJECT: AD/CR Comments on IG's Survey of OCR

"As a consequence of this recommendation, the concept of an advisory committee on selection was discussed with one of OCR's outside consultants, the associate librarian of the Yale University Library. It is significant to note that the selection function is now viewed in many universities as a prime and sole responsibility of the librarian. The use of committees has been increasingly discredited due to lack of effective performance.

..."

6. Our main concern about the present method of selecting books is based upon the fact that it does not take advantage of the knowledge and competence of many of the Agency's best qualified authorities in various areas of selection. We consider the head of the Selection Staff to be highly competent, but no one can properly do his job without considerable advice and assistance. He realizes this and solicits advice from Agency officers he knows well and whose judgments he respects. However, our inspection indicated that he was overlooking some of our most knowledgeable experts, e.g. those on the ONE staffs.

7. CRAG 6-61 describes CIA selection policy in the most general terms. It points out the limited library space and reminds that most books are ephemeral in their interest to Agency readers. This Selection Policy, i.e. CRAG 6-61, will be reissued within the next two or three weeks. A rider will be attached to it which will appeal to all for help in selecting books. This may be useful and it may be the only feasible method for tapping our experts for selection guidance. In any event it is an acceptable alternative attempt to resolve some of the reported inadequacies in the book-selection process.

for J. S. Earman
Inspector General

Attachment a/s

DEC 50 2 30 PM '63